UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,215	12/21/2001	Ryoma Oami	Q67860	9094

7590   12/08/2005

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER
VO, TUNG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20,23 and 24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *21 and 22* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20,23 and 24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/28/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-20 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ryoo (US 5,990,957) in view of Sun (US 5,790,196).

Re claims 1-2, 5-6, and 19-20, Ryoo discloses a moving picture encoding system (fig. 1)

for encoding moving picture sequences with respect to each object, comprising:

a coding means (15 and 11 of fig. 1) for encoding object picture data consisting of time

series sequences of video object planes (VOPs) (11 of fig. 1), each of which is a picture image of

the object at a point of time, and shape information data indicating the shape of the object in each

VOP while conducting bit rate control so that the number of generated bits for each VOP meets a

target bit number (15 of fig. 1), and outputting coding information including a quantization

parameter used in encoding and the generated bit number along with obtained bit streams (c61.

3, line 55-col. 4, line 32), and outputting the result as area data (col. 5, line M-col. 5, line 43);

a predictive area calculating parameter extracting means (24 and 25 of fig. 2) for

obtaining a function that indicates temporal variations in the area of the object based on the

history of the area data (25 of fig. 2), and outputting a parameter specifying the function or a

Page 5 predictive value of the area obtained by the function (24 of fig. 2) ms a predictive area

calculating parameter (col.6, line 59-col. 9, line 5);

a bit number model parameter calculating means (26, 27 and 29 of fig. 2) for calculating

a parameter used in modeling the generated bit number per unit area of the object based on the

coding information (col. 4, lines 59-67), the generated bit number and the area data, and

outputting the result as a bit number model parameter (27 of fig. 2, see col. 1, lines 1-3, and 8-

14);

a predictive bit number calculating parameter extracting means (28 of fig. 2) for

obtaining a function that indicates temporal variations in the bit number model parameter based

on the history of the bit number model parameter, and outputting a parameter specifying the

function or a predictive value of the bit number model parameter obtained by the function as a

predictive bit number calculating parameter (col. 9, lines 27-67); and

a target bit number calculating means (29-31 of fig. 2) which performs a series of

processes calculating a target bit number for the next VOP to be encoded (col. 10, lines 1-40),

and outputting the target bit number;

sequentially for each of VOPs in the certain period of time (29 and 32 of fig. 2);

a storing means (14 of fig. 1, note a VOP memory temporarily stores VOPs) for

temporarily storing object picture data consisting of time series sequences of video object planes

(VOPs), each of which is a picture image of the object at a point of time, and shape information

data indicating the shape of the object in each VOP; wherein the total number of allocatable bits

for multiple un-coded VOPs within multiple frames in a certain period of time (Col 11, line 45-

col. 12, line 10; see TABLE 2).

It is noted that Ryoo does not particularly discloses an area calculating means for

calculating the area of the object in each VOP based on the shape information data; and for

calculating an un-coded VOP allocatable bit number that is the total number of allocatable bits

for multiple un-coded VOPs in a certain period of time based as a time span on allocatable bit

number information indicating the total number of allocatable bits for the VOPs in the certain

period of time and the number of generated bits for the encoded VOPs in the certain period of

time as claimed.

However, Sun teaches an area calculating means for calculating the area of the object in

each VOP based on the shape information data (Note the specification of the invention describes

that the size of object as area; in figure 1 of Sun suggests VO1 and VO2 within the VOP 1 and

VOP2, respectively, wherein the size of VO1 or VO2 is obtained for bit calculation); and means

for calculating an un- coded VOP allocatable bit number that is the total number of allocatable

bits for multiple un-coded VOPs in multiple frames (fig. 1; Note Sun also suggests the encoder

to encode a set of frames based on the total target bits frames) in a certain period of time as a

span time based on allocatable bit number information indicating the total number of allocatable

bits for the VOPs in the certain period of time and the number of generated bits for the encoded

VOPs in the certain period of time (col. 8, lines 64-68, e.g. subtracting (difference) the actual number of header bits for all objects (VO1, VO2) in a previous frame is in between as the number of generated bits for the encoded VOPs (VOP1, VOP2); and the total number of target bits available for those objects (VO1, VO2) in an instant frame (un-encoded frame or input video frame) is interpreted as the total number of allocatable bits for multiple uuencoded VOPs (VOP1, VOP2)).

Therefore, taking the teachings of Ryoo and Sun as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Sun into the encoding system of Ryoo for the same purpose of performing the subtracting function as claimed.

Doing so would provide an improved bit rate control system based on a quadratic rate distortion model.

Re claim 3, Ryoo further teaches wherein a moving picture sequence may include a plurality of objects (figs. 5A and 5B).

Re claim 4, Ryoo further discloses wherein a moving picture sequence may include a plurality of objects (MPEG-M standard, fig. 5A and 5B).

Re claims 7-10, Ryoo further teaches the bit number model parameter is a complexity index per unit area of the picture (col. 5, lines 1-3, note quantization matrix and complexity classifier 21 of fig. 2); and the target bit number calculating means calculates the target bit number based on a product of a predictive value of the complexity index and a predictive value of the area data (col. 10, lines 1-4).

Re claims 11-14, Ryoo further teaches the bit number model parameter calculating means (27 and 29 of fig. 2) calculates the bit number model parameter with respect to each VOP type;

and the predictive bit number calculating parameter extracting means (28 of fig. 2) calculates the predictive bit number calculating parameter with respect to each VOP type (col. 9, lines 54-67).

Re claims 15-18, and 21 -22, Ryoo further teaches wherein a constant, which can make a variation in quantization fineness among objects, is used when the target bit number is calculated (col. 10, lines 41-50).

Re claims 23 and 24, Ryoo teaches the moving picture encoding system is carrying out the method for encoding moving picture sequences with respect to each object, so the encoding system would obviously have a program for conducting a computer to execute the encoding method.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued that Ryoo and Sun fail to teach or suggest calculating an uncoded frame allocatable bit number, corresponding to multiple uncoded VOPs/frames in a certain period, pages 18-23.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Ryoo teaches the total allocatable bits numbers for multiple uncoded VOPs within multiple frames (figs. 5A and 5B) in a certain period (col. 11, lines 45-col. 12, lines 9); and Sun suggests calculating an un-encoded allocatable bit number corresponding to multiple uncoded VOPs within frames (fig. 1), and also for each VO and VOPs of the frame (T of TABLE 1, Note T is Total texture bit count (all VOs) T[i] Bit count for ith VO including texture, shape, motion and header bits T Total bit

count including texture, shape, motion and header bits (all VOs), wherein the Vos are within

multiple frames). In view of the discussion above, Ryoo and Sun are combinable to make

obvious the claimed invention.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

        Kawashiwa et al. (US 6, 819,712) discloses video encoding apparatus and video encoding

method.

Contact Information

        Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tung Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7340. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on 571-272-7418. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tung Vo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2613